

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 22.03.2016

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI
and
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.VENUGOPAL

W.P. No.7730 of 2016

Bank of Baroda
Regional Office (Madurai Region)
rep. by its Deputy Regional Manager ... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Chairman,
Tamil Nadu State Level Scrutiny
Committee and Secretary to
Government,
Adi Dravidar & Tribal Welfare Department,
Namakkal Kavingnar Maligai,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai - 9.

2.District Collector,
Collectorate, Salem - 636 001.

3.S.Kowsalya .. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of The Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a writ of mandamus directing the respondents 1 and 2 to consider the various representations, the latest of which being dated 03.08.2015 proceedings No.RO:MADU:HRM:01:1224 of the petitioner and determine the community status of the third respondent in a time bound manner.

For Petitioner .. Mr.P.Raghunathan
for M/s.T.S.Gopalan & Co.,

For Respondents .. Ms.A.Srijayanthi,
Spl. Govt. Pleader for R1 and R2

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by SATISH K.AGNIHOTRI, J.)

Ms.A.Srijayanthi, learned Special Government Pleader accepts notice on behalf of respondents 1 and 2. On 02 March 2016, notice was ordered to the third respondent. Private notice sent to the third respondent was returned with an endorsement "no such addressee". Thus, with the consent of the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for respondents 1 and 2, the writ petition is taken up for final disposal.

2. Seeking a direction to respondents 1 and 2 to consider the representations of the petitioner including the last representation dated 03 August 2015 to determine the social status of the third respondent in time bound manner, the petitioner Bank has come up with this writ petition.

3. Pursuant to our notice, the first respondent has filed counter affidavit stating that the Vigilance Cell has been asked to submit a report within a period of 15 days on 09 March 2016. It is further stated that on receipt of the Vigilance Cell Report and depending on the nature of the report, further steps will be taken.

4. Learned Special Government Pleader appearing for respondents 1 and 2 submits that appropriate order will be passed, after the receipt of Vigilance Cell Report. It is further submitted that a Division Bench of this Court, wherein, one of us (Satish K.Agnihotri, J.) was a Member, in G.Venkitasamy Vs. The Chairman, State Level Scrutiny Committee, Chennai², has laid down guidelines to consider the applications for issuance of social status certificate.

5. In view of the foregoing, respondents 1 and 2 are directed to examine the application as well as the report of the Vigilance Cell in the light of the guidelines laid down in G.Venkitasamy's case (supra), within a period of three months from today. The writ petition stands disposed of accordingly. No costs.

Sd/-
Asst.Registrar (CS III)

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

mmi

To

1.The Chairman,
Tamil Nadu State Level Scrutiny
Committee and Secretary to
Government,
Adi Dravidar & Tribal Welfare Department,
Namakkal Kavingnar Maligai,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai - 9.

2.The District Collector,
Collectorate, Salem - 636 001.

1 cc to M/s.T.S. Gopalan & Co, Advocate, Sr.18127

W.P.No.7730 of 2016

KJI (CO)
kk 18/4



WEB COPY